ISSN : 1979-6889

DIRECTIVE DILIVERY IN SKRIPSI EXAMINATION

Suprihadi [1]

ABSTRAK

Episode tanya jawab dalam sebuah ujian skripsi mahasiswa bersifat unik sehingga menarik untuk dikaji. Pertama, episode ini merupakan inti dari sebuah ujian skripsi sehingga dipersepsikan oleh mahasiswa sebagai sesuatu yang "manakutkan". Kedua, peran, fungsi, dan hubungan antar kekuatan para pihak yang terlibat dalam ujian, yaitu para penguji dan mahasiswa teruji, sudah sangat jelas. Oleh karena itu tindak tutur dari para penguji diasumsikan akan cenderung direktif.

Jenis penelitian ini adalah analisis wacana (discourse analysis). Korpus data dalam penelitian ini berupa satu sesi tanya jawab dalam sebuah ujian skripsi antara seorang mahasiswa (teruji) dengan dua orang penguji. Teknik analisis yang digunakan adalah teknik analisis kualitatif, dengan pendekatan teori tindak tutur (speech act theory), atau yang oleh Eggins dan Slade (1997) disebut sebagai pendekatan logico-philosophic.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: 1) jenis tindak tutur yang dominan digunakan oleh para penguji skripsi adalah directives; 2) Tindak tutur direktif tersebut tidak diekspresikan langsung tapi melalui hubungan yang kompleks antara bentuk dan fungsi, yaitu antara permintaan dan pertanyaan (requests and questions) dan antara perintah dan anjuran (orders and suggestions): perintah dikemas dalam bentuk permintaan dan anjuran, dan bentuk permintaan dapat berfungsi sebagai pertanyaan. Penelitian ini juga menunjukkan bahwa ada kalanya penyuji melemparkan pertanyaan sungguhan (real questions), bukan pertanyaan dalam konteks ujian (exam questions), yang jawabannya sudah diketahui penanya/penguji.

Saran untuk mahasiswa adalah agar mereka peka terhadap hubungan yang kompleks antara bentuk dan fungsi bahasa yang muncul dalam ujian skrisi sehingga mereka dapat memberikan respons yang tepat. Bagi dosen, penting kiranya membekali mahasiswa dengan strategi-strategi menempuh ujian, khususnya ujian skripsi sehingga mereka dapat lebih siap dalam menghadapi ujian.

***Kata kunci**: speech acts, thesis, examination, Question and Answer*

ABSTRACT

Question and answer episode in an exam a student thesis is unique, so interesting to study. First, this episode is at the core of a thesis examination so perceived by students as something "scary". Secondly, the role, function, and the relationship between the strength of the parties involved in the test, namely the examiners and the students tested, was very clear. Therefore, speech acts of the testers are assumed to be inclined directive.

Kind of research is discourse analysis (discourse analysis). The corpus of data in this study form a question and answer session in a test between a student thesis (tested) with two testers. The analysis technique used is the qualitative analysis techniques, with approaches the theory of speech acts (speech act theory), or which by Eggins and Slade (1997) referred to as Logico-philosophic approach.

The results showed that: 1) the dominant type of speech acts used by the testers thesis is

[1] Staf Pengajar Fakultas FKIP Universitas Muria Kudus

directive, 2) Follow the said directive is not expressed directly but through a complex relationship between form and function, namely between requests and inquiries (requests and questions) and between command and advice (orders and suggestions): orders are packed in the form of requests and suggestions, and request forms can function as a question. This study also shows that there are times when penyuji throw a real question (real questions), not a question in the context of the exam (exam questions), the answer is already known to pen / testers.

Advice for students is that they are sensitive to the complex relationship between form and function of language that appeared in the exam skrisi so that they can provide an appropriate response. For faculty, it is necessary to equip students with test taking strategies, especially the thesis exam so they can be better prepared in facing the exam.

***Key words**: speech acts, theses, examination, Question and Answer*

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

One of the compulsory subjects included in the S1 curriculum of the English Education Department of the University of Muria Kudus (hereafter EED UMK) is Skripsi Writing. After completing the writing of the *skripsi*, the student will undergo an examination before the Board of Skripsi Examiners, which comprises four examiners: the first two are the supervisors, while the other two are independent examiners. The examination is divided into four stages: 1) Opening; 2) Presentation; 3) Question-and-Answer; and 4) Closing. It is the Question-and-Answer (hereafter Q-and-A) which is considered as the core of a *skripsi* examination.

In the Q-and-A, the student and the examiners are engaged in a dynamic conversation and functioning the language as the primary medium. The pattern of interaction seems to be the same with that described by Sinclair and Coulthard (in Nunan, 1993:36-37), in which one of the examiners initiates the interaction by asking a question for which he/she mostly knows the answer, the student gives respond, and the examiner provides some sort of evaluation of the response. Sinclair and Coulthard called the three-part structure an *exchange*. The three components making up the exchange they called *moves*, which were made up of *speech acts*. The basic building block, then, is the speech act, which is an utterance described in terms of its function (Nunan, 1993: 37). Searle (in Schiffrin 1994: 54) proposes that "the speech act is the basic unit of communication." This view places speech acts at the very crux of the study of language, meaning, and communication.

Speech acts are simply things people do through language, for example, apologizing, complaining, instructing, agreeing, and warning. The term 'speech act' was coined by the linguistic philosopher Austin in 1962 and developed by another philosopher Searle in 1969. They maintained that, when using language, we not only make propositional statements about

objects, entities, state of affairs, and so on, but we also fulfill functions such as requiring, denying, introducing, apologizing etc.

One of the assumptions underlying *skripsi* examination is that both the student and the examiners have mastered the content of the *skripsi* being examined. However, in this context, of course, questions from the examiners will not be considered infelicitous. Another assumption is that *skripsi* examination resembles classroom environments, in which the roles, functions, and power relationships between the participants, the examiners and the examinee, are well-defined (Nunan, 1993: 9). In addition, *skripsi* examination must operate within academic atmosphere, which is often perceived by students as formal and "frightening". These assumptions then lead to further assumption that *skripsi* examiners will tend to be directive. *Directive* itself is a kind of action that a speaker can perform in speaking, by means of the illocutionary act of his utterance, as an attempt to get the addressee to do something as in requesting, questioning, advising, pleading, etc.

With these assumptions in mind, a substantial question arises: "How do *skripsi* examiners use the language to deliver their *directives*?" This central question derives other questions: "Do *skripsi* examiners always 'to the point' in delivering their directives or there is some kind of a joint production conversation (Stubb, 1983: 21) in which the speakers (examiners) constantly take account of their audience (examinee) by designing their talk for their hearers?" A study by Mehan indicates that with respect to a teacher's oral questioning, in reality, 'the interrogator and the respondent work together to jointly compose the "social fact" we call an answer-to-a-question' (in Cohen, 1998: 217).

In line with the background described above, I would like to conduct a study to investigate how *skrpsi* examiners deliver their speech acts, especially the *directives*. The objectives of this studys are then: 1) to find out the dominant speech act used by *skripsi* examiners; 2) to give a brief account of how *skripsi* examiners deliver their *directives*.

Directives can be expressed in a variety of syntactic forms. Ervin-Trip (Ervin-Trip, 1976: 25-26 in Marasigan, 1983: 35) discussed six types of directives:

1. Need Statements, such as "I need a match".
2. Imperatives, such as "Gimme a match," and elliptical forms like "a match".
3. Imbedded imperatives, such as "Could you give me a match?"

   In this case, agent, action, object, and often beneficiary are as explicit as in direct imperatives, though they are imbedded in a frame with other syntactic and semantic properties.

4. Permission directives, such as "May I have a match?"
   Bringing about the condition stated requires an action by the hearer other than merely granting permission.
5. Question directives, like, "Goota match," which do not specify the act.
   Hints such as "The matches are all gone".

Beside ***directives***, there are four other basic kinds of action that one can perform in speaking, by means of the following 4 types of illocutionary acts (Searle, 1976 in Levinson, 1983: 240; Searle, 1979 in Schiffrin, 1994: 57-58; Marmaridou, 2000:182).

1. **Representatives**, which commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition, or to tell people how things are, as in hypothesizing, concluding, asserting, etc.
2. **Commissives**, which commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to some future course of action as in promising, offering, threatening, undertaking, etc.
3. **Expressive,** which express a psychological state in the speaker regarding a state of affairs that the expressive refers to or presupposes but does not assert. Typical expressive are thanking, congratulating, apologizing, welcoming, etc.
4. **Declarations,** which effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and which tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions as in declaring war, nominating a student, christening, firing from employment, etc.

A requirement for the five classifications of illocutionary acts is that they must be distinguished from illocutionary verbs, which is only one kind of *illocutionary force indicating devices* (IFIDs) that may be used in performing an illocutionary act. The more important for Searle's theory is that the illocutionary force of an utterance may not directly correspond to its literal meaning (Marmaridou, 2000: 182): there is a distinction between literal sentence meaning and speaker's intended utterance meaning. For example, the speaker may utter (1) below in order to request the hearer to do something:

(1) I want you to d it.

This utterance is a statement, but it is used as a request. Therefore, utterance (1) performs an *indirect speech act*. If in the above utterance the illocutionary force depends on speaker intentions and context, it is also a fact that some sentences are conventionally used to perform a certain illocutionary act, even though they appear to be performing another. This is the case of such example (2) below, which is used as a request rather than to elicit information

about one's abilities.

(2) Can you reach the salt?

In view of the above, Searle (in Marmaridou, 2000:183) makes the following statement:

> In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers or rationality and inference on the part of the hearer. (Seaele, 1979: 31).

To further support his statement, Searle focuses on the performance of *indirect directives*, which he considers as an outcome of politeness strategies. He observes that sentences uttered as indirect directives do not have an ordering force as part of their meaning, since their literal meaning is not inconsistent with the denial of their ordering intent, as in (3) below:

(3) I'd like you to do this for me Bill, but I am not asking you to do it.

Searle claims further that indirect directives are not ambiguous between an imperative illocutionary force and non-imperative one, given a particular context. For example, (2) may be intended as, and commonly associated with, a request, even though it may also be uttered by an orthopedist who wants to know the progress of an injured arm, in which case it is used to elicit information. In the given context, then, (2) is not ambiguous. Significantly there is a systematic and conventional relation between directive illocution and sentences like (2), which is not present in, for example, rejecting proposal, as in B's utterance in (4) below:

(4) A: Why don't you go to the cinema tonight?

B: I have to study for exam.

Searle claims that conventionality of (2) to convey a directive is due to the fact that the literal meaning of an indirect directive like (2) is at the same time a preparatory condition of requesting: one can grant the request if one can actually reach the salt. By comparison (4) does not make reference to any conditions, preparatory or otherwise. To the extent that not all about one's ability count as requests, the hearer relies on factual background information and general principles of conversation to work out the intended illocutionary act. Evidently, in the same way that there are meaning conventions in the use of words, there are also usage conventions in expressing illocutionary acts (Marmaridou, 2000: 184).

Classifying Speech Acts. The condition underlying and defining speech acts are central to speech act theory: they are the basis for the way we recognize and classify speech acts (and

thus identify an utterance as a particular type of "unit") and for the way a single utterance can have more than one functions (i.e. more than one "unit") (Schiffrin, 1994: 90). Therefore, identifying the speech act being performed by a particular utterance can only be done if we know the context in which the utterance takes place. (Nunan, 1993: 65).

Beside the identification of speech acts *per se*, another issue critical to the application of speech act theory to discourse is the sequential arrangement of speech acts: how an initial speech act creates an environment in which a next speech act is (or is not) appropriate. This issue bears centrally to discourse analysis simply because discourse (by definition) is comprised of sequentially arranged units, and because sequential regularities (sequences that fulfill our expectations) are a key ingredient in our identification of something as a text (Schiffrin, 1994: 63).

In sum, speech acts can be classified into groups and subgroups by a principle set of criteria. Communication relies upon shared knowledge of the name and type of speech act: speaker and hearer share knowledge of how to identify and classify an utterance as a particular "type" of act, as a unit of language that is produced and interpreted according to constitutive rules.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Basically, this study is a discourse analysis. The subjects of this study are two independent examiners, Examiner 3 and Examiner 4, of a *skripsi* examination taking place at EED UMK. Beside their independence, the two examiners represent their relative teaching experience: Examiner 3 is senior while Examiner 4 is junior.

The data are collected from the transcription of an audio-recorded oral examination of a *skripsi* written by a student of EED UMK. The corpus of the data consists of a hundred and fifteen lines or moves. The utterances under analysis are those performed by the subjects, which cover eighty one speech acts, including cases of 'one form for many functions', for which classification refers to the functions. Transcription of the oral examination refers to Eggins and Slade (1997: 1-5).

Analysis of the data of this studys refers to the principle of discourse analysis with reference to Speech Act Theory Approach (Schiffrin, 1994). The speech acts referred to in this study are those developed by Searle (Searle, 1976 in Levinson, 1983; Searle, 1979 in Schiffrin, 1994 and Marmaridou, 2000).

FINDINGS

After being identified and classified, the speech acts within the *skripsi* examination under study fall into three categories of Searle's speech act taxonomies, i.e. representatives, directives, and expressive. Commissives and declarations are not found in this study. The summary of the speech act categories is shown in Table 1.

From Table 1 we can see that the *skripsi* examination is dominated by directive speech acts: 67 out of 81 or 82.72%. It means that the two examiners mostly use directives, of which their illocutionary point is an attempt by S, the examiner, to get H, the student, to do something (A). It seems reasonable, then, that in *skripsi* examination, which more or less resembles an oral interview, Q-and-A is the core of this activity.

Speech Acts	Examiner 3		Examiner 4		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Representatives			11	13.38	11	13.58
Directives	31	93.94	36	75.00	67	82.72
Expressives	2	6.06	1	2.08	3	3.70
TOTAL	33	100	48	100	81	100

Table 1 Summary of Speech Act Performance of the *Skripsi* Examiners

What makes a *skripsi* examination different from ordinary oral interviews is that the former is always within the educational context for which every effort is directed to the benefit of the student. Hence, I would rather call *skripsi* examination 'collaborative supervising' than examination *per se*, so that suggesting becomes part of it. However, issues of power relationship, politeness strategy, and background knowledge of the examiners are also parts of a *skripsi* examination.

DISCUSSION

As it has been stated above, the *skripsi* examination under study is dominated by directive speech acts, in which there are acts of requesting, questioning, ordering, and suggesting. The smell of directive has appeared since the very beginning of the examination, represented by the short utterance of Examiner 4 "Page forty-two." which can be well interpreted by the Student as a request or command to open (and read) the page. Indeed, the examiner could have said: "Would you please open page forty-two?" or just "Open page forty-two." The intended meaning of the utterance is well understood since *skripsi*

examination is an 'open book' test, so that mentioning a certain page means a request to refer to that page. The statement of Examiner 4 in her second move is not an assertion but a question, asking for confirmation of what the Student has written. This kind of confirmation is common in *skripsi* examination as part of the examiner's initiating the Q-and-A episode, since what is being assessed is what the student has written. This indirect speech act is a realization of the examiner's politeness strategy since the essence of questioning is due to the unclear description by the writer, though it is not always the case in examination context. The real question from Examiner 4, in the sense of asking the content of the *skripsi*, appears in her third move. These three moves constitute initiation in Sinclair and Coulthard's model of interaction, which is considered as the utmost importance in spoken discourse because it imposes constraints on what is to come next and so determine the structure of the discourse (Bolivar, 1994: 278). And what comes next is the student's attempt to realize the request, which, in this context, is obligatory due to the power relationship between the examiner and the student.

The above initiation pattern is the same as that performed by Examiner 3 in their first exchange. He begins by directing the student to overview the page being questioned (line 69), then to answer his question (line 70). The difference between the first exchange with Examiner 4 and that with Examiner 3 lies in the fact that each leads to different discourse structure: the sequence of the speech acts.

A question-answer sequence is based at least partially on propositional information (Schiffrin, 1994: 89). It is this propositional information which makes the sequence of the speech acts performed by Examiner 4 is different from that of Examiner 3, especially after the first exchange. Relatively longer sequence exists in the former, due to longer meaning negotiation, than in the latter before the participants move to another proposition.

The long run negotiation happens between Examiner 4 and the student because *Q-and-A* episode is so important for the student as it determines the degree of success or failure. Even when the examiner has concluded in move 8: *Do you really know the difference among them, among the three validities?*, which commits her to the inability of the student to realize her question or request in move 3, and offered two successive pieces of advice in line 9 and 11 and followed by a request in line 12, the Student still tries to negotiate. The peak of the negotiation concerning the proposition ends in move 16 (representative-concluding): *Do you really eee understand the difference among them before you choose content validity?*, by which the examiner 'words the world' (Mey, 1993: 155). In other words, the examiner concludes that in reality, the world, the student is not able to demonstrate her request or

question to explain the proposition so that she describes this state of affairs in the world with her words, the language, in the form of indirect illocution. The fact that utterances and speech acts need not have one-to-one relationships (Schiffrin, 1994: 85) is well manipulated by Examiner 4 to convey her politeness strategy in moves 8 and 16 by not saying, for example, "You don't understand the concept, do you?" or more impolite and discouraging statements. In this way, the examiner is playing her role to keep the show going on.

1. Relationships between Questions - Requests

Let's move back to directives. Comparison shows that the preparatory, sincerity, and essential conditions for questions and requests are similar (Schiffrin, 1994: 71). The difference between questions and requests is hat what a speaker wants through a question ('elicit information') is more specific than what a speaker wants through a request ('do A'). What this suggests, then, is that questions are specific type of requests: questions are attempts to get hearer to do a certain A - to provide information (Searle, 1969 in Shiffrin, 1994: 72). It can also be said that a request typically requires either a physical or verbal act or both, while a question requires a verbal act, either spoken or written, as its follow up.

Could you explain to me about these validities; content, empirical and face? (line 3), *Could you tell me more about specification instructional objectives?* (line 33), *Could you explain it?* (line 41), and *Could you explain this?* (line 82), are conventionally or syntactically requests. However, the propositional content of the predicate *explain* and *tell* require verbal acts as their follow-ups, so that they are all classified as questions. Furthermore, to the long standing tradition, questions in interrogative form are in fact *requests to tell* (Levinson, 1983: 275). This implies that, if reversed, requests to tell, and so requests to explain, are questions.

The above interpretation may not be applied to line 19: *You should explain what is content validity, what is empirical validity, and what is validity.* which is clearly not a question just because of the predicate *explain*. This speech act is a request because the propositional content of this utterance is a future act of the H or the student, i.e. to revise the *skripsi* as it is made clearer by the next moves (line 20-22). This analysis of speech acts is in line with the experiential view (Marmaridou, 2000: 208) that action scenes evoke and are evoked by lexical frames which may either in themselves perform a speech act, or merely describe it. The former lexical frames are commonly called speech act verbs. In the absence of speech act verbs, which is more often the case, an utterance may be relativized to such a space in terms of an institutionally determined speech situation and the role of the interlocutors in it. In this case, the situation sets up this space pragmatically (Marmaridou, 2000: 208).

Contrary to Searle's claim that indirect directives do not have an ordering force (in Marmaridou, 2000: 183), indirect directives such as those in lines 3, 33, and 41 do have ordering forces. In a *skripsi* examination nothing but answer or do the requests of the examiners can be done by the student.

As it has been assumed, in a *skripsi* examination both the student and the examiners have mastered the content of the *skripsi* being examined. However, it sometimes happens that this assumption is not reflected as in the case of the *skripsi* examination under study, in which 'exam questions' be 'real questions'. The sincerity condition for the question of Examiner 4 in move 26: *What is the relationship between using content validity and making specification instructional objectives?* that she wants the information is realized in her continual questions about the proposition in that move, despite the unclear responses from the student. The high proportion of this speech feature gives significant information about the speaker, i.e. Examiner 4. The preparatory condition that Examiner 4 dos not know the answer is observed in move 52, when she relies on another examiner (*Or, is it a reason Pak Ris* (Examiner 2)?) and move 56 (*Eee, I still do not understand about this.*) by which she asserts her confusion.

The phenomenon 'exam questions' being 'real questions' is not apparent in Examiner 3's moves. Move 76: *How many research questions or 'statements of the problem' in your skripsi?* is clearly not a 'real question', and so are moves 80 and 81, since all of these have been in the *skripsi*. The questionings of the proposition in moves 76 and 80 ends in move 83: *Okay, please revise these parts.* in which Examiner 3 breaks the conversation, after a ten-second pause which is interpreted as the student's inability to answer the question, with the disjunction marker 'okay' and goes on to another proposition of requesting to revise. Move 83 means or indicates that Examiner 3 'knows the answer' of his question in move 80. It is move 83 which is actually his target. This issue also happens in move 101, which is a reflection of his preceding 'exam questions' not 'real questions'.

2. Relationships between Requests - Orders- Suggestions

According to Relevance Theory, acts of saying, telling and asking are universal and largely depend for their understanding on the form of the utterance, the addressee's accessible assumptions and the principle of relevance (Marmaridou, 2000: 206). Therefore, imperative utterances (telling to) lead to the recognition that the state of affairs described is being represented as desirable from the speaker's point of view (in which case they belong to the requestive type) or from the addressee's point of view (thus belonging to the advisory type).

Imperatives are rarely used to order or request in conversational English, but occur

regularly in recipes and instructions, offers (*Have another drink*), welcoming (*Come in*), wishes (*Have a good time*), curses and swearing (*Shut up*) and so on (Levinson, 1983: 275). Instead, we tend to employ sentences that only indirectly requesting.

Requests, orders or commands and suggestions are slightly different. The illocutionary points of the three, all are directives, are the same: attempts by S to get H to do A. The difference lies in: 1) the strength with which the illocutionary point is presented; 2) the status of S and H; and 3) the propositional content. In a request S believes that H might not mind doing the act requested, which is reflected in the mood of the verb, while in suggestions the point of view is from H or for the benefit of H, without S being necessarily of higher status than H. In other words, a request is weaker than a command or order, but stronger than a suggestion. In a command, the first principle, mind or not mind, is somewhat marginalized because the status of S is higher than H.

Comparison of requests, commands and suggestions, then, results in Table 2. However, applying this matrix in a *skripsi* examination is complex. Because of power relationship, for example, in a *skripsi* examination requests and suggestions frequently mean commands or orders: moves1, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 83, and 101 are all requests having the force of commands or orders. The simplest move "*Page forty-two*" (move 1) will derive its direct request force it if is in "*Please open page forty two.* or indirect request force as in *Would you please open page forty-two?"* without necessarily losing its order force in this particular context. Let alone if it is in Open page forty-two. However, Examiner 4 leaves her utterance open Page forty-two because it is not only the Student who is following the examination, but also other examiners. In this way her move is open to other examiners.

Criteria	Requests	Orders	Suggestions
Illocutionary point	Attempts of S to get H to do A	Attempts of S to get H to do A	Attempts of S to get H to do A
Direction to fit	World-to-word	World-to-word	World-to-word
Psychological state	Want	Want	Want
Strength	Less strong	Strongest	Least strong
Status of S and H	S is not necessarily higher than H	S is higher than H	S is not necessarily higher than H, but usually is
View point/benefit	Speaker	Speaker	Addressee

Table 2 Relationship between Requests-Orders-Suggestions

Another example is move 19: "*You should explain what is content validity, what is empirical validity, and what is face validity".* The sentence-type (or word order as one of the IFIDs) of this move is declarative, which is prototypically an assertion and/or a question

rather than a request. As it has been stated before, move 19 is clearly not a question in spite of the fact that it is a request to explain. In terms of its propositional content, this move is an expansion of move 13: *Okay, you should eee, - put more explanation about these validities - you must add what is content validity, empirical and face validity*. However, since the Student is trying to negotiate in move 14, Examiner 4 has to restate her request in move 19 and restate again in move 20. Those two preceding moves, 13 and 14, provide a context to understand move 19, i.e. that the intended meaning is 'to revise' not to explain orally, and revising clearly has the force of order in *skripsi* examination setting. Indeed, the force of order has appeared in move 13, when Examiner 4 rephrases using *must*: - *you must add what is content validity, empirical validity and face validity.* Even clearer, Examiner 4 expands it with move 20: *Ya, you just - you should add == more explanation about that*, which is immediately overlapped by the Student by breaking it with confirmation in move 21: *Ya, okay.*

Inner complex relationship within directives also happens between suggestions and orders or commands. Explicit usage of the word 'suggest' does not always indicate that the utterance has the illocutionary force of suggesting, as in the following:

(5) I suggest that you leave now.
(6) I suggest that you left the room to avoid being seen.

The utterance in (5) has the force of an order whereas (6) has an epistemic sense: that the proposition expressed in it is to be believed or accepted as true (Marmaridou, 2000: 215).

From different view point, the use of the word 'suggest' in move 12: *Well, I suggest that you should eee give more explanation about the other two validities here, then after that you explain why you choose content validity, not the other two validities, so it will be eee clearer for the readers* does not prevent it from having the illocutionary force of an order in the context of *skripsi* examination. The case also happens in move 18: *That - that's why I suggest that you should explain more about those three validities*. and move 111: *Okay, but I suggest that you delete the description about the instrument from page fifty-two, this part's for "Result of Investigation.* Genuine suggestions, however, might also appear as in move 9: *Because when you - when you determine to choose content validity you must - you must know to differentiate ya - the difference between ==* and move 112: *You'd better move this to 'instrument'*, in which the force of optionality is high, or move 109*: == Try out.* In which Examiner 3 is clearly giving suggestion to substitute the English 'try out' for the code-switched 'uji coba'.

As a functional item of politeness, *please* can co-occur with different surface syntactic

structures. It can co-occur only with a sentence which is interpretable as a request (Stubb, 1983: 72), of which its state of affair is desirable from the speaker's point of view. Seeing the distribution of *please* in move 83: *Okay, please revise these parts,* this move is a request. However, complex relationship between requests-orders-suggestions comes out here in this move. Therefore, though move 83 is technically a request, it has the force of suggestion. However, because of power relationship, *Please revise these parts has* the illocutionary force of an order.

CONCLUSION

It is probably become obvious by now that speech acts cannot be studied independently of the social contexts in which they occur or regardless of the interactional basis of communication. The analysis of the speech acts in the social contexts of Q-and-A episode of a *skripsi* examination in this study leads to the conclusion that:

1. The dominant speech act performed by the *skripsi* examiners under study in the Q-and-A episode is *directives*.
2. The *directives* are expressed in a complex "one form for many functions" relationship of requests and questions and requests, orders and suggestions: orders are hidden in requests and suggestions; requests having the force of questions. This complex relationship is mostly because of power relationship in a *skripsi* examination between the student and the examiners and of the spirit of benefiting most for the student. These two factors, non-linguistic or experiential contexts (Nunan, 1993: 8), support Searle's claim that the context is more dominant in revealing the illocutionary force than any explicit illocutionary force indicators. This study also reveals that there appear cases in which 'exam questions' be 'real questions', which is more or less contrary to the assumption that in testing context the teacher 'knows the answer'. Interesting also to note that as many studies of directives have shown, this study also reveals that the examiners express their directives through indirect speech acts. Beside as a manifestation of their politeness strategies, this creates a magical but friendly atmosphere of the *skripsi* examination as such that it does not discourage the student to defend what has been written.

SUGGESTIONS

The suggestion related to the significance of this study is that students should be sensitive to the fact that in a *skripsi* examination there is a complex relationship between what

the examiner says and what he/she intends to say. Students should be sensitive, for example, as to when the questions are 'exam questions' and when they are 'real questions'; when suggestions are 'genuine suggestions' and when they are 'order-force suggestion'. Sensitivity to these phenomena will enable them to select and apply the most appropriate test-taking strategies in *skripsi* examination. It is the role of the teacher to introduce test-taking strategies of *skripsi* examination to the students so that they be more readily to enter the arena.

For further study, it is interesting to note Hoenisch's (1998) suggestion to synthesize different approaches into a single formalized approach that reduces the constructs supplied by each of them to non-redundant components which can be applied to data as needed. This is due to the fact that in the analysis of the same data, each approach may yield different result. Meanwhile, the application of any one approach by different researchers to the same data may also produce divergent conclusion.

Last but not least, it is interesting to note here what Schiffrin says:

> *The most general lesson to be drawn from all these specific problem is that it is difficult to provide criteria allowing us to decide what counts (or doesn't count) as an instance of speech act in such a way that other investigator would identify the act in the same way. ... Would others agree with our analytic categories and be able to discover them independently of our own efforts? (Schiffrin, 1994: 88).*

REFERENCES

Bolivar, Adriana, 1994. The Structure of Newspaper Editorial. In Coulthard, Malcolm (ed.). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. pp 276-294. New York: Routledge.

Cohen, Andrew D, 1998. *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Demo, Douglas A., 2001. Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher. *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Digest*. September 2001.

http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/0107demo.html. July 29, 2002.

Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade, 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Hoenisch, Steve, 1998. Interpretation and Indeterminacy in Discourse Analysis. http://www.criticism.com/d/da_indet.html. July 29, 2002.

Leech, Geoffrey N., 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited

Levinson, Stephen C, 1983. *Pragmatics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marmaridou, Sophia S.A., 2000. *Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mey, Jacob L., 1993. *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher.

Nunan, David, 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: The Pinguin Group.

Sciffrin, Deborah, 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher

Stubbs, Michael, 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Urmson, J.O. and Marina Sbisa (Eds.), 1975. *J.L. Austin How to Do Things with Words: Second Edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BIODATA PENULIS

Nama	:	Drs. Suprihadi, M.Pd.
NIP	:	19570616 198403 1 015
Tempat dan tanggal lahir	:	Kebumen, 16 Juni 1957
Pangkat/Golongan	:	Pembina Tk. I/ IVb
Jabatan Fungsional	:	Lektor Kepala
Alamat Rumah	:	Mlati Kidul RT 06/01 No.54
		Kudus 59319
		e-mail: pakpriumk@gmail.com
Pendidikan Terakhir	:	Magister Pendidikan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Pengalaman Penelitian:

1. Speech Act Analysis of a Thesis Examination, 2006
2. The Impact of Explicit Strategy Trainings on the Reading Comprehension of the Students of English Education Department of the University of Muria Kudus (2007).
3. Test-taking Strategies Used by the Students of English Education the Faculty of Teacher Training Education the University of Muria Kudus (2009)

Publikasi Ilmiah

1. Retorik dalam Penciptaan Humor, Majalah Ilmiah KOPERTIS WILAYAH VI Volume XV NO.23, April/Mei 2004
2. The Paradox of Question and Answer Episode of a Thesis Examination, TEFLIN Journal (Accredited) Volume 15 Number 2, August 2004
3. For Those Who Are Moderate (Book Review). Dipublikasikan dalam Website: http://www.amazon.co.ac (2005).
4. Oh as a Marker of Information Management: an Analysis of the Trifles Script. MAWAS Vol.22 No.01, Juni 2009.